REMARKS

Claims 1-67 were pending at the time of examination. Claims 2-3, 28-29 and 43-44 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 11, 16-19, 21-22, 27, 30-31, 33, 36, 39-41, 42, 45-46, 48-50, 52, 57-60, 62-63 and 65 have been amended. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 63 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the terms "the at least one computer readable product" lacks antecedent basis in these claims. The applicants have amended claims 63 and 65 to recite "the computer readable product" and submit that both claim 63 and claim 65 are definite and that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-23, 25-46, 47, 48-64 and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002-0091533 to Ims et al. (hereinafter Ims). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Generally, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 3 (now cancelled) in order to more clearly define the correlation information. Claim 1 has also been amended to more clearly specify that the message interchange network is built on an open platform that overlays a public network (such as the Internet), and that the services each is accessible "according to properties and permissions associated with each service in the plurality of services."

As was discussed in the previous Office Action response, the method recited in claim 1 allows correlation information to be tracked for the application-level messages so that it is clear for each application-level message that traverses the message interchange network, whether the message is related to any other messages in the message interchange network, and if so, what those messages are. The tracking can relate to, for example, request messages and associated responses, or status messages indicating whether a particular call of a service succeeded or failed, and so on, as described with respect to FIGs. 4A and 4B. As a result, the tracking of correlation information allows any end point or service on the message interchange network to

easily gain a clear picture as to what is happening with messages sent as a result of its interactions with diverse services. Furthermore, since the retained correlation information is performed by a single intermediary network, the correlation information is standardized and easily compiled in to a clear summary of interaction results (see specification, paragraph **[0147]**).

As is specified in claim 1, the correlation information includes one or more of:

> "a Hop Identifier (ID) uniquely identifying a hop between a sender and receiver of the each application-level message, call information regarding a call to which the each application-level message and any other related application-level message belongs, and session information regarding a session to which the each application-level message and any other related application-level message belongs."

This correlation information is required in the applicants' invention, since the message interchange network is built on an open platform overlaying a public network and each of the services is by default accessible to all the other services (and wherein each service specifies its own access policies), which provides the desired scalability of the message interchange network, as discussed in the application.

In contrast, Ims addresses the issue of doing business using automated electronic business services, and in particular the incompatibility issues of different proprietary systems used by the parties involved in a business process. The solution proposed by Ims is to pass all messages between the business partners in an extensible markup language format, such as XML, and then translate the messages into the appropriate proprietary formats when they are received by the respective business partners (paragraph [0065]). Ims further states that "Preferably, high-performance transformations of this type are performed for documents in a critical path for the performing of an e-business service" (paragraph [0066]). Alternatively, "specially customized logic" can be used (paragraph [0066]). No such transformations are necessary in the applicants' invention, as defined in claim 1, as each service publishes its properties and permissions so that any other service knows what types of messages will be accepted and rejected.

Furthermore, the system in Ims is not built on an open platform overlaying a public network, as required in claim 1. On the contrary, it requires that "a group of trading partners has agreed on how services and information should be exchanged for a particular e-business service" and that "preferably, TPAs have been created to define the roles and parameters of the agreement" (paragraph [0064]). That is, rather than having an open platform, as specified in claim 1, where any service is available to the other services, Ims is a "closed system" that requires pre-determined agreements, such as Trading Partner Agreements, that define the roles of each partner in the e-business system. Since these agreements exist, it is known *a priori* how

messages will be routed between the different business partners involved in the business process in Ims's closed system, and there is no need to track correlation information, as specified in claim 1.

Lastly, the Examiner states in the Office Action that "correlation information are the orders in XML format, it is being sent across the network between plurality of vendors..." (page 3, item 6). However, claim 1, as amended, very clearly spells out what is intended by "correlation information," which is very different from the Examiner's definition. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Ims, and that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 4-26 all depend from claim 1, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejections of claims 4-26 should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 is a computer system claim with limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claims 27 should be withdrawn.

Claims 30-41 all depend from claim 27, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27, and the rejections of claims 30-41 should be withdrawn.

Claim 42 is a *Beauregard* claim corresponding to claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claim 42 should be withdrawn.

Claims 45-67 all depend from claim 42, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 42, and the rejections of claims 45-67 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ims in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,031 to Picher-Dempsey (hereinafter Picher-Dempsey). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Picher-Dempsey shows a network monitoring system in which only authorized users are allowed to make IP/QoS (Quality of Service) reservation requests. The Examiner argues that combining these techniques with Ims would render obvious "determining whether the first service is authorized to make the query and only sending correlation information to the first service when it is determined that the first service is authorized logging of billing information."

The applicants respectfully disagree that it would be obvious to combine these two documents, since Ims operates in an environment where pre-determined agreements already exist. Thus, in Ims there already are defined permissions and roles of the partners involved in the business process and how messages are routed between the partners, and there would be no need to determine the permissions of a particular business partner.

Furthermore, even if one assumes that it were possible to combine Ims and Picher-Dempsey, it would still not render claims 24 and 65 any more obvious than claims their respective independent claims 1 and 42, respectively, as Picher-Dempsey does not cure the other deficiencies of Ims discussed above. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 24 and 65 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Fredrik Mollborn
Reg. No. 48,587

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300